

REMARKS

The Examiner rejects claims 26-29 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Marchosky.

Claim 32 distinguishes over Marchosky at least for the following reasons. Claim 32 recites providing a separate user storage for association of user identifiers dependent on previously determined user ID information, providing a separate data object category storage for association of data object identifiers and access right categories, said data object identifiers forming structural connections to types of people or contextual associations with subject areas, and said data object identifiers also reflecting structural connections to studies or findings, providing a separate access right storage for association of the user identifiers with the access right categories, and determining an access right dependent on the data object identifier and also on the user identifier by use of the user storage and the data object data category storage, and also based on determining an association of the user identifier with at least one of the access right categories by use of the access right storage so that the access right is also determined dependent on the association of the user identifier with the at least one access right category. On the other hand, Marchosky only teaches providing a unique patient ID number which is randomly assigned (paragraph 0060). That unique number then in turn references the patient's folio (paragraph 0060). Using variables of patient registration information, different levels of access and control are offered (paragraph 0075). Depending on which portions of this patient registration information is input it is determined which categories of information can be accessed (paragraph 0075). For example, input of the patient's full name, birthday, and social security number may be used to gain access to general information about the patient. On the other hand, adding the State or

Country of birth plus a healthcare provider's access number, for example, allows an internist to access to past history sections of the patient's folio; and a pharmacist access number may allow access to only medications and an allergy section of the folio. See paragraph 0075.

Thus Marchosky does not have the three separate storages as recited in claim 33 but only a user storage which performs the retrieval of certain categories of information as discussed above. And when accessing information based on input of the unique patient ID number, there is no use of the three storages recited in claim 32 in combination to provide the access right.

Independent claim 33 distinguishes at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 32 but also by reciting additional features not suggested such as the alternative listing of specific structural connections, and also by reciting that the data object identifiers reflect at least one of affiliation with clinical studies, with series of diagnostic findings, or exposures of a long period of time, or with specific diagnostic image types. Marchosky does not teach these structural connections to the data object identifier actions.

Also enclosed is a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg.No.27,841)

Brett A. Valiquet
Schiff Hardin LLP
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 258-5786
Attorneys for Applicants.
CUSTOMER NO. 26574

CHI\5992287.1